DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 168 460 IR 006 770

AUTHOR Haughey, Charles F.
TITLE A Collaborative Federal/State Evaluation: The State Capacity Building Grants Program on Dissemination, The Federal Program Perspective.
INSTITUTION National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 30 Mar 78
NOTE 17p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Toronto, Canada, March 30, 1978) ; Appendix may be marginally legible

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Activities; Background; Educational Research; *Federal State Relationship; Grants; *Information Dissemination; *Interagency Coordination; National Programs; Objectives; Program Planning; State Departments of Education
IDENTIFIERS *Educational Information; *State Dissemination Grants Program

ABSTRACT

The evolution, operation, and evaluation of the State Dissemination Grants Program are described. This collaborative effort between the National Institute of Education (NIE) and the State Education Agencies (SEA's) is the third stage in a program development process begun by NIE in 1970 as one of five elements in a dissemination capacity building strategy aimed at building nationwide dissemination capacity. The program presently serves SEA's and will, potentially, address dissemination problems of large urban school districts. Two types of grants--capacity building grants and special purpose grants serving short term dissemination needs--are funded yearly. In each funded project, a balanced development of resources, linkage, and leadership are encouraged. Evaluation of the programs by NIE is difficult because of their non-prescriptive approach and the collaborative nature. Collaborative evaluation is seen as the solution, although it places a burden on the grantee; only experimentation with this type of evaluation will demonstrate the success or failure of such an approach. An outline of NIE's expectations for the program and a summary of the program's activities during 1977 illustrate the program's effectiveness. (Author/MBR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED168460

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

A COLLABORATIVE FEDERAL/STATE EVALUATION: THE STATE CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS PROGRAM ON DISSEMINATION THE FEDERAL PROGRAM PERSPECTIVE

Charles F. Haughey

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Dissemination and Resources Group
National Institute of Education

Paper presented at the annual meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Toronto, March 30, 1978

IR006 770

A COLLABORATIVE FEDERAL/STATE EVALUATION:
A STATE CAPACITY BUILDING GRANTS PROGRAM ON DISSEMINATION
A FEDERAL PROGRAM PERSPECTIVE

It is appropriate that consideration of the State dissemination grants program and of the program's evaluation starts with the term collaborative. Collaborative effort has characterized the program throughout its existence. For example:

- o It began with joint planning by State and federal representatives,
- o Each project blends State and federal resources in pursuit of mutually accepted objectives,;
- o The overall goal of the program - enhanced nationwide dissemination capacity - is expected to serve both State and federal interests.

It seems a necessary first step in this discussion - particularly in presenting a federal agency perspective - to establish rather precisely the meaning of collaboration as it applies to this program. Once that is accomplished, the discussion can proceed to a description of the program and its evaluation as seen from the program side. Salient aspects of program operation will provide a context for subsequent presentations. Then, a program manager's concern and expectations about evaluation efforts will be presented.

Program Collaboration

There are two ways of defining collaboration; it can mean either (1) working together in the artistic of scientific sense or (2) working together with an enemy. There is probably little need to specify why the first definition fits the program but it may be helpful to describe the collaboration occuring in the State dissemination grants program and then to clarify why the second definition does not apply.

Fundamentally, collaboration occurs here because it is intended by both sets of participants. The program was planned by State and federal dissemination representatives who established their cooperative working relationships before the form or nature of the program was set. These relationships are strengthening because each of the two levels of government involved contributes something essential to the program. When the program started, NIE had a then uncommon interest in education dissemination. State education agencies (SEA's) shared that interest.

Common interests provided a reason to work together; synergy reinforced the relationship. NIE could provide sufficient funds to crystallize existing interest in dissemination within an SEA; SEAs could provide the staff, structure, and operating environment necessary to develop dissemination capacity. NIE

give budgetary priority to dissemination concerns. The availability of Federal funds for SEA dissemination activities raised the priority SEAs placed on dissemination.

Given that basis for working together, development of inter-agency relationships appears to be a critical element in the program's growth, particularly when the roles of grantee and grantor, evaluatee and evaluator are often seen as opposed side in an adversary relationship. In this program, it has been important that the roles of various parties be perceived as supportive of the collaboration and that each project become a vehicle for attaining goals shared by State and Federal participants. Substantial benefits accrue if common role conflicts are avoided; when, for example:

- o The grantee and grantor relationship emphasizes equity of two partners sharing resources and capacity with one another;
- o The State and Federal agency relationship stresses parity based on common commitment;
- o The project monitor and project director share concern for identifying and fulfilling the range and scope of project activities;
- o The evaluator and the program and project staff have common interest in understanding program strengths and weaknesses as thoroughly as possible.

Certainly, collaboration has been a key attribute of the State grant program. Early emphasis on the term seems as appropriate to today's discussion as it did to the State program's development. But, however necessary it has been to program development, working together is not sufficient to guarantee program or evaluation success. In fact, experience with the State grants program has not necessarily prepared anyone to specify the conditions necessary for success. It has, however, provided some experience in working out the problems.

The SEA Dissemination Grants Program

The State dissemination grants program is the third stage in a program development process that started in 1970 with the award of three pilot state grants and a related evaluation contract. The program passed through a three-year cycle of funding for the pilot states and a consequent three-year cycle for a set of six State variation models. It emerged as a program for support of SEA dissemination capacity building efforts, funding proposals that are competively chosen in a formal procurement process that is now entering its fourth iteration.

The program is one of five elements in a dissemination capacity building strategy aimed at fulfilling that part of the Federal dissemination responsibility that deals with building nationwide dissemination capacity. This strategy is intended to strengthen dissemination in a variety of agencies, starting with the governance system. The program presently

serves SEA's and will, potentially, address dissemination problems of large urban school systems. Other approaches in this strategy include working through education associations, academic institutions that prepare educators, and parent and community groups.

The capacity building strategy itself, is one of a rather complex set of dissemination strategies that are organizationally linked in NIE's Dissemination Resources Group. Among them, the state program is notable for its explicit concern for user capacity in the dissemination configuration and as an expression of Institute concern for dissemination in the operating education system. While other dissemination programs tend to be producer-based (conveying research products or results to potential users) this program was designed to help improve the capacity of people in schools and classrooms to reach out and take whatever information, knowledge, practices, products, or program is most appropriate to their needs.

The program has been, from its inception, both client-based and collaborative. It was designed in concert with SEA dissemination representatives; chief State school officers were consulted about the concepts on which it is based, and SEA staff as well as academic consultants have been heavily involved in proposal review. In addition, monitoring processes have tended to be as collaborative as possible. The program has encouraged project directors to consult with monitors on issues of concern. Monitors, themselves, have regarded SEA project staff as the primary experts on the goals and conduct of individual projects.

Operationally, in requesting proposals from SEA's the program has sought state plans for development of dissemination capacity in an individual agency.* Under funding arrangements, we have awarded one-year grants in the context of a three-to five-year plan. Each proposal has been reviewed for compliance with the program scope and for clarity and attainability of objectives. In a proposal's objectives and approaches the State, itself, defines what capacity constitutes the basis for each project.

In a given project, the program has encouraged a balance among development of three aspects of dissemination capacity: resources (those tangible items that stand as surrogates for knowledge), linkage (human or mechanical intermediaries that provide access to resources); and leadership (that advocacy and adminstrative capacity that makes a program function effectively.) Primarily, projects are urged to provide access for all who are involved in the education process to whatever resources they may need to do their work effectively. The key elements of a project, then are:

> Linkage and leadership collaboratively developed to provide all those involved in education with comprehensive access to generalized knowledge resources.

*Attachment A outlines staff expectation for the program.

Each year two types of grants have been funded: capacity building grants of the sort discussed above and special purpose grants which serve short-term dissemination needs. The current evaluation is concerned with capacity building grants only. Ten such grants were funded in the first year of competition, fourteen in the second, and six this year. An additional competition is being announced now and will be held later this Spring. Of the thirty states so far funded, one has temporarily withdrawn from the program after completing the first year of a long-term project.

Most state proposals have been for a five-year program term; experience shows that most SEAs that chose a shorter project period in their first proposal subsequently proceed to ammend their plan to participate for the full five year of funding for which the states are eligible. Federal support is typically about $100,000 for the first year and decreases gradually to about half that level in the fifth year.

Program Evaluation Expectations

In common with other agencies, the Dissemination and Resources Group in NIE regards the evaluation function as an activity somewhat apart from program management. The evaluation specialists and the evaluation contractor(s), as well, operate one level removed from the operational concerns of the program and its projects. They function in a world that is separate and, perhaps, antiseptic in contrast to program operations. That status assures a useful degree of objectivity and encourages an attitude of detachment; it also may provide a basis for a kind of "we/they" feeling. Such a feeling - unless very carefully treated - leads to one set of actors or the other thinking that it is the function of evaluation to play critic while others try to make things happen. Such an attitude may be necessary to accomplish some of the ends of evaluation but is not an easy way to approach collaboration.

There is a second potential source of incongruence in views of program and project objectives. Where evaluation thrives on carefully specified outcomes and well-controlled project circumstances, this program functions without precisely described outcomes or circumstances of operation. As in other Federal agencies, a program is approved and funds provided in NIE only after careful scrutiny. The agency endorses the objectvies that program staff propose. In this case, a primary objective was to elicit SEA collaboration in the development of dissemination capacity.

Overall, program objectives are rather broad, and essentially non-prescriptive At a gross level, the program objectives could be satisfied by selecting projects for funding and keeping projects within their scope through compliance monitoring.

The program does not venture or advocate major changes in schools or school systems as a function of these grants; nor even require that projects express their aspirations in terms of "improving instruction", "facilitating organizational renewal" or "using research-based knowledge". We assume that these are among the potential elements of a program that would be considered by an SEA

and that the SEA is in the best position to include or exclude such expectations within a given plan.

In program planning, no real concern was given to problems that our non-prescriptive approach might present for evaluation. In turn, relatively little attention was given to specifying expectations that program staff held for an evaluation program. Perhaps that was a mistake. In the future, program offices might well consider building expectations for evaluation as part of the program planning just as expectations are established for training, technical assistance and other elements of the program. In doing so, program staff would seek three basic outcomes:

1. A program manager really needs to know if the program is doing anything wrong; a major function of the evaluation is to identify program flaws.
2. A program manager needs to know the strengths in the program; a second function of evaluation is to identify whatever the program is doing right.
3. The program manager needs to get evaluation readings before the flaws get reinforced and the stregths eliminated; the knowledge to be gained from the evaluation should be provided in timely fashion.

Experience with this program suggests that certain hazards associated with evaluation make the evaluation contractor's position more difficult in a collaborative program than is the case with more direct, more prescriptive, less open programs. Looking back to the evaluation of the pilot program - the antecedent of SEA capacity building we find hints that there may be something about this kind of program that makes its evaluation particularly difficult. Sieber's work on the pilot state evaluation might be summed up in this fragment from his report: "despite its messy theoretical foundations, it seems to have worked and I am still trying to understand why." He judged the pilot work to be successful despite finding that there was no precedent in education for the work projects did, that clients did not fully understand what the projects were doing, and that no power was invoked to support the changes that came about in classrooms and schools.

In reviewing Sieber's study, Clark has recently suggested that only a pilot program would have worked under those circumstances, not because of inherent flexibility but because Federal program management would have insisted on more rigid standards had the program been larger and the activity would then have lost the adaptability needed for success.

Clark's analysis suggests that there is substantial justification for loosening the hold of goal-bound program development when success of the process can be predicted and when there is evident need to respond to unpredictable circumstances. As a substitute for rigidity in planning,

Clark offers a "responsive planning structure which emphasizes needs capacity analysis and which is balanced and realistic". However retrospective the argument, Clark's suggestion bolsters the defense of our program approach. If that case can be made convincing, one could proceed to advocate that evaluation of programs like this one invoke goal-free evaluation as a part of their approach.

The value of the kind of flexibility associated with freedom from fixed goals is one major observation from our experience thus far. Another suggests that no subtlety, no sophistication, no funding level, can permit us to develop or to evaluate more program than is actually in operation. Complex programs may require subtle evaluation processes but that need is established only after direct approaches are shown to be inadequate. Any goal to be evaluated must correspond both in context and in perception to the goals of operational activities. Whatever rhetoric is used in either operational or evaluation proposals, the least common denominator for both is a straightforward expression of the goals to be pursued in the operational activities. The measure of those goals is the nucleus of an evaluation.

Evaluation and Collaboration

With respect to program goals, a collaborative program places evaluators on somewhat treacherous ground. In the state dissemination grant program, for example:

- collaboration produces goals that are acceptable to a variety of viewpoints and thus lack the precision that authority provides in unilateral goal-setting.
- collaboration weakens the authority associated with roles, with organization, even with resources. Thus, the granting agency cannot reasonably resort to control by purse-string.
- diversity among grantees is accepted and so respected that no advantages, no incentives are associated with commonality across projects.

To the evaluator's disadvantage, the capacity building program is not firmly anchored by its goals. Adaptability rather then stability is its hallmark. And quite deliberately so. Collaboration among complex bureaucracies requires give and take one way or another. When objectives are fixed legislatively (e.g. Title IX) then adminstrative procedures provide for accommodation. When, as in the case of this program, it is the process (dissemination capacity building) that is fixed administratively, then the objectives to be attained are subject to accommodation through collaboration of the funding agencies and the grantee. In such a circumstance, the evaluator must be as facile in coping with agencies as with variables. Negotiation aptitude becomes as necessary as analytic skills. Lead time for assuring participant satisfaction is as much a planning factor as lead time for clearances.

If the State dissemination program experience is something of a case study in collaborative evaluation, then there should be a recognition of the bias from this perspective before discussion proceeds. Collaborative evaluation is seen as essential by the program office. If it works well,

it will benefit SEA projects as well as the program. Its major drawback is the exceptional burden it imposes on the evaluation office and the contractor.

It should be noted here that both the contractor and the NIE evaluation staff have expended a considerable amount of energy and concern in making their own collaboration work. If the approach works as expected, their success will be well earned. Even if present optimism is not fully justified, the effort will certainly contribute to understanding the extent to which collaborative evaluation is feasible.

References

1. Clark, David L. National planning for educational dissemination and utilization: A search for effective alternatives. Unpublished paper prepared for a discussion at the Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development November, 1977.

2. Sieber, Sam D. Research on knowledge utilization: The pilot State dissemination program. Paper presented at the Research Conference on the Diffusion and Adoption of Educational Innovation, School of Education, Indiana University, July, 1973.

3. Sieber, Sam D., Karen S. Louis and Loya Metzger The Use of Educational Knowledge. New York: Bureau of Applied Social Research, Columbia University, 1972. ED

4. Program Description: State Dissemination Grants Program FY 1977. Washington: Communication and Linkage Branch, Division of Information and Communication Systems, Dissemination and Resources Group, National Institute of Education, 1977.

Attachment A

Outline: Expectations for State Dissemination Grants Program

I. NIE agenda: NIE will completely fulfill its dissemination mandate only when all participants in the educational enterprise (including women, minority groups, and the disadvantaged) have full access to and use a full range of educational resources, including the outcomes of education research and development.

II. Dissemination grants program role: encourage agencies to establish or extend education dissemination activities

   A. Foster development of national capacity by assisting selected individual agencies or institutions to develop comprehensive dissemination capacity

   B. Encourage agencies to study, plan, carry out, evaluate their dissemination improvement efforts.

III. Program purpose: NIE support helps SEA to build dissemination programs in more innovative, deliberate, and analytical fashion than is possible without external support.

IV. Approach to dissemination capacity: facilitate use of wide range of knowledge resources.

   A. Provide access (locate/use current resources)

   B. Arrange deliberate efforts to facilitate use

V. Comprehensive dissemination capacity

   A. Leadership/service capability to provide information, technical assistance in solution of problems identified by agencies or clientele

   B. Program components

      1. Resources
      2. Linkage
      3. Leadership/management

VI. Generalized capacity: all resources available for all educators notwithstanding subject field or role

VII. Leadership activites are those necessary to create, manage system to coordinate, integrate linkage, resources components

A. Leadership manifest in carefully designed activities to coordinate disparate program elements

B. Facilitate interaction among various dissemination activity scattered among operational components of the agency

C. Project director takes agency lead in evaluating dissemination policy and providing technical and program information services

D. SEA dissemination programs are coordinated at the operational level

VIII. Resources program establishes access to resources available nationally

A. Assembled or dispersed

B. Negotiate; search/retrieval;

C. Screening/processing

D. Transformation/synthesis

E. Evaluation of utility

IX. Linkage: facilitates access, acceptance, successful utilization of knowledge resources

A. Materials, mechanism contribute to linkage

B. Linkage designed within state to meet its needs

C. Interpersonal communication is essential in one or more of various forms.

Attachment B

MEMORANDUM

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

TO : Addressees Below

DATE: February 1978

FROM : Charles E. Hauchey
Chief, Communication and Linkage Branch

SUBJECT: Report on the State Dissemination Grants Program

This report is the third in a series of reports to States. It summarizes activities conducted under the FY 1977 State dissemination grants program, including the awarding of both new and continuation awards early in FY 1978.

Background

Since FY 1975, NIE has collaborated with State education agencies that wish to improve their dissemination capabilities. Two types of awards are made under the program:

- o Capacity building grant awards to develop or improve comprehensive dissemination capacity in State education agencies. These grants are of one-year duration, potentially renewable over three-to-five years.

- o Special purpose grant awards to support relatively low-cost, short-term efforts to deal with specific dissemination problems such as training or planning.

Through the State dissemination grants program, 10 capacity building and 5 special purpose grants were awarded in FY 1975. In addition to continuing the previously funded capacity building projects, NIE in FY 1976 awarded 14 new capacity building and 5 special purpose grants. The remainder of this paper reports on new and continuation grants awarded as a result of our FY 1977 competition.

The Institute believes the State dissemination grants program is an important way to help States develop dissemination capacity to better serve the information and technical assistance needs of educators, including teachers and administrators. This belief is founded on the premise that improved access to and increased use of pertinent educational information and assistance at State and local levels will facilitate increased rationality in addressing educational problems and issues.

The present program capitalizes on the demonstrated ability of State education agencies to develop and sustain effective, comprehensive, and generalized dissemination capacities. The program provides Federal assistance -- on a cost-sharing, collaborative basis -- for up to five years of dissemination program effort in a State. This Federal assistance is designed to decrease over the projected period of funding with SEA funding increasing.

New Grants

In FY 1977 the funds available for new grants were limited because the number and costs of projects to be continued were higher than we had expected. In effect, our action in funding 14 new projects in FY 1976 had increased FY 1977 continuation costs above estimates by about $400,000; that, in turn, reduced the funds available for new starts. As a result, we expected to have $300,000 available in FY 1977 compared with the $1 million commitment for each of the previous years.

We asked the chief State school officers to advise us on whether the money should be spent for capacity building projects only, special purpose projects only, a combination, or for technical assistance projects. Responses varied but the general recommendation was to proceed with a competition for two types of awards: capacity building awards to develop State dissemination capacity and special purpose awards to support dissemination planning and other limited dissemination activities. The program announcement which appeared in the April 6, 1977 issue of the Federal Register (see Attachment A), reflected the chiefs' advice.

In response to the announcement, 16 States submitted proposals for new grants, 9 for capacity building projects and 7 for special purpose projects. Each proposal was reviewed by six individuals: two members of NIE's Information and Communication Systems Division, one member of the Project Review Board appointed for this program, one person from another NIE or Federal office, one representative of the academic community familiar with knowledge dissemination and utilization, and one State education agency representative knowledgeable about the State dissemination programs (see Attachment D). The review involved a two-step process -- proposal evaluation by individual reviewers and a general discussion of each proposal's strengths, weaknesses, and overall merit for funding. Review scores were used as aids but recommendations for State funding and the funding priority order resulted from the judgments of the NIE Project Review Board and program management.

Of the 16 applications for new dissemination grants, NIE expects to support 6 capacity building projects (Arizona, Nebraska, Oklahoma, Utah, Virgin Islands, and Wisconsin) and 5 special purpose projects (Arkansas, District of Columbia, Hawaii, Vermont, and Washington). Abstracts of these proposals are contained in Attachment B.

Our initial plan called for funding State applications for new grants up to the $300,000 level in FY 1977 and deferring funding of other technically acceptable proposals until FY 1978. When processing of all new State dissemination grants was delayed until FY 1978, we were able to fund all technically qualified State grant applications in FY 1978 in a single funding process at a total cost of $763,000.

Debriefing Session

As is customary with the State dissemination grants program competition, NIE will arrange to confer with State representatives to discuss their proposals that were not funded. Staff and reviewers' comments on proposals' strengths and weaknesses will be considered as well as suggestions for strengthening the proposals for future funding possibilities.

Continuation Grants

Of the 10 capacity building grants awarded in FY 1975, 9 submitted applications in FY 1977 for a third year of funding, one State having chosen to withdraw after the initial year of funding. Of the 14 grants awarded in FY 1976, 13 SEAs applied for their second year of Federal funds. At the time this report was prepared, continuation grants had been awarded to 16 of the 23 (Alabama, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Kansas, Massachusetts, Minnesota Montana, New York, Rhode Island, South Carolina, and Texas). Abstracts of these continuations are provided in Attachment C. Still under review are proposals from six SEAs (Alaska, Illinois, Kentucky, New Hampshire, New Jersey, and Oregon). Michigan's continuation application is not due until the spring of 1978.

Continuation proposal reviews were handled individually rather than as a group, because the continuation projects had different expiration dates. Each proposal was read by five reviewers -- three NIE staff and two external to NIE (one from a State education agency, and one from the academic community). Attachment E is a list of the continuation proposal reviewers' names and affiliations. External reviewers were selected from among those who had read the initial proposal so that they had some familiarity with the project. Reviewers' scores and comments were summarized by the NIE project monitor in the process of preparing a funding recommendation. Following Branch discussion of the proposal's technical quality and funding merit, a final recommendation was made to the Contracts and Grants Management Division.

State Capacity Building Evaluation

The evaluation of the capacity building projects of the State dissemination grants program is continuing into its second year through a contract with the National Testing Service (NTS) of Durham, North Carolina. Last year NTS, collaborating with the States and NIE, developed a longitudinal evaluation design to examine whether State dissemination capacity is being built and what the program's effects are. As a result of NIE review, additional design work on the conceptual framework is now underway and scheduled to be completed soon. The technical assistance workshop series initiated with the States last year will be continued, with one workshop related to evaluation activities and another to technical assistance.

A Final Word

Apparently States find the program useful, and we appreciate the cooperation of our SEA colleagues who have collaborated in its development and administration. We encourage those States that have not yet received Federal funding to explore with us ways in which NIE can help build their State dissemination capacity.

Attachments

cc: Chief State School Officers
SEA Dissemination Representatives
Directors of State Dissemination Projects
Proposal Reviewers
Interested NIE Staff

ATTACHMENT A

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

National Institute of Education

STATE DISSEMINATION GRANTS PROGRAM, FY 1977

Closing Date for Receipt of Applications

Notice is hereby given that pursuant to the authority contained in section 405 of the General Education Provisions Act, as amended, 20 U.S.C. 1221e, and 45 CFR Part 1460, applications are being accepted from State education agencies (SEAs) for grants under the State dissemination grant program.

Awards will be made (i) for new special purpose or capacity building dissemination grants and (ii) for continuation of capacity building grants made in fiscal 1975 and 1976.

Applications for new grants must be received by the National Institute of Education, Proposal Clearinghouse, on or before June 1, 1977, in accordance with the following instructions:

A. Applications sent by mail. An application sent by mail should be addressed as follows: National Institute of Education, Proposal Clearinghouse, Washington, D.C. 20208, Attention: NIE State Dissemination grants program. An application sent by mail will be considered to be received on time by the Clearinghouse if:

(1) The application was sent by registered or certified mail not later than the fifth calendar day prior to the closing date (or if such calendar day is a Saturday, Sunday or Federal holiday, not later than the next following business day) as evidenced by the U.S. Postal Service postmark on the wrapper or envelope, or on the original receipt from the U.S. Postal Service; or

(2) The application is received on or before the closing date by the mail room in Washington, D.C. of either the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare or the National Institute of Education. (In establishing the date of receipt, the Director of the Institute will rely upon the time-date stamp of such mail rooms or other documentary evidence of receipt maintained by the Department or the Institute.)

B. Hand-delivered applications. An application to be hand delivered must be taken to the Proposal Clearinghouse, 1832 "M" Street, NW, Washington, D.C. Hand-delivered applications will be accepted daily between the hours of 9 a.m. and 4:30 p.m., Washington, D.C. time, except Saturdays, Sundays and Federal holidays. Applications will not be accepted after 4:30 p.m. on the closing date of June 1, 1977. A receipt will be issued upon acceptance of the application package.

Applications for continuation grants are due approximately three months before expiration of the existing capacity building grant.

C. Program information and forms. Information and application forms may be obtained from the Information and Communication Systems Division, Office of Dissemination and Resources, National Institute of Education, Room 711, 1200 19th Street NW., Washington, D.C. 20208, telephone 202-254-7930.

D. Applicable regulations. The regulations applicable to this program include the National Institute of Education General Provisions Regulations (45 CFR Subchapter A) published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on November 4, 1974 at (39 FR 38992) and regulations for the State dissemination grants program published in the FEDERAL REGISTER on June 16, 1975 (40 FR 25454).

(Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Number 13.950, Educational Research and Development.)

Dated: March 31, 1977.

HAROLD L. HODGKINSON,
Director,
National Institute of Education.

[FR Doc.77-10153 Filed 4-5-77;8:45 am]